

[illegible]

TERMS OF THE TRIBUNE.

RATES OF SUBSCRIPTION (PAYABLE IN ADVANCE).
 Postage Prepaid at this Office.
 Daily, 1 year, \$12.00; 6 months, \$7.00; 3 months, \$4.00.
 Single copies, 5 cents.
 Foreign, 1 year, \$15.00; 6 months, \$9.00; 3 months, \$5.00.
 Single copies, 10 cents.
 Advertising, 10 cents per line for first insertion; 5 cents for each subsequent insertion.
 Special arrangements made with clubs.
 The Tribune is published every day except on Sundays and public holidays.
 It is sold by all news-vendors.
 Address: THE TRIBUNE COMPANY, 100 N. LAKE STREET, CHICAGO, ILL.

TO-MORROW'S AMUSEMENTS.

MOORE'S THEATRE—Ninth street, between Chestnut and La Salle. "The Two Orphans."
ADOLPH THEATRE—Dearborn street, corner Madison. "The Two Orphans."
WICKES THEATRE—Madison street, between Dearborn and State. "The Two Orphans."
ACADEMY OF MUSIC—Herald street, between Madison and Monroe. Engagement of Frank Chautau.

SOCIETY MEETINGS.

ST. GEORGE'S—Regular monthly meeting of St. George's Episcopal Association will be held on Monday evening, March 1, at 8 o'clock, at the residence of Mr. J. H. Smith, 100 N. La Salle street. All members of the association are requested to attend. A large attendance is desirable. By order of the association, C. J. BURROUGHS, Secretary.

BUSINESS NOTICES.

CHICAGO CALIFORNIA CLUB—The regular monthly meeting of the club will be held on Monday evening, March 1, at 8 o'clock, at the residence of Mr. J. H. Smith, 100 N. La Salle street. All members of the club are requested to attend. A large attendance is desirable. By order of the club, C. J. BURROUGHS, Secretary.

THE CHICAGO TRIBUNE.

WE MEAN ALL WE SAY.—FULLY ESTABLISHED. Our circulation is 100,000. We are published every day except on Sundays and public holidays. It is sold by all news-vendors. Address: THE TRIBUNE COMPANY, 100 N. LAKE STREET, CHICAGO, ILL.

THE CHICAGO TRIBUNE.

WE MEAN ALL WE SAY.—FULLY ESTABLISHED. Our circulation is 100,000. We are published every day except on Sundays and public holidays. It is sold by all news-vendors. Address: THE TRIBUNE COMPANY, 100 N. LAKE STREET, CHICAGO, ILL.

THE CHICAGO TRIBUNE.

WE MEAN ALL WE SAY.—FULLY ESTABLISHED. Our circulation is 100,000. We are published every day except on Sundays and public holidays. It is sold by all news-vendors. Address: THE TRIBUNE COMPANY, 100 N. LAKE STREET, CHICAGO, ILL.

THE CHICAGO TRIBUNE.

WE MEAN ALL WE SAY.—FULLY ESTABLISHED. Our circulation is 100,000. We are published every day except on Sundays and public holidays. It is sold by all news-vendors. Address: THE TRIBUNE COMPANY, 100 N. LAKE STREET, CHICAGO, ILL.

THE CHICAGO TRIBUNE.

WE MEAN ALL WE SAY.—FULLY ESTABLISHED. Our circulation is 100,000. We are published every day except on Sundays and public holidays. It is sold by all news-vendors. Address: THE TRIBUNE COMPANY, 100 N. LAKE STREET, CHICAGO, ILL.

THE CHICAGO TRIBUNE.

WE MEAN ALL WE SAY.—FULLY ESTABLISHED. Our circulation is 100,000. We are published every day except on Sundays and public holidays. It is sold by all news-vendors. Address: THE TRIBUNE COMPANY, 100 N. LAKE STREET, CHICAGO, ILL.

THE CHICAGO TRIBUNE.

WE MEAN ALL WE SAY.—FULLY ESTABLISHED. Our circulation is 100,000. We are published every day except on Sundays and public holidays. It is sold by all news-vendors. Address: THE TRIBUNE COMPANY, 100 N. LAKE STREET, CHICAGO, ILL.

THE CHICAGO TRIBUNE.

WE MEAN ALL WE SAY.—FULLY ESTABLISHED. Our circulation is 100,000. We are published every day except on Sundays and public holidays. It is sold by all news-vendors. Address: THE TRIBUNE COMPANY, 100 N. LAKE STREET, CHICAGO, ILL.

THE CHICAGO TRIBUNE.

WE MEAN ALL WE SAY.—FULLY ESTABLISHED. Our circulation is 100,000. We are published every day except on Sundays and public holidays. It is sold by all news-vendors. Address: THE TRIBUNE COMPANY, 100 N. LAKE STREET, CHICAGO, ILL.

THE CHICAGO TRIBUNE.

WE MEAN ALL WE SAY.—FULLY ESTABLISHED. Our circulation is 100,000. We are published every day except on Sundays and public holidays. It is sold by all news-vendors. Address: THE TRIBUNE COMPANY, 100 N. LAKE STREET, CHICAGO, ILL.

THE CHICAGO TRIBUNE.

WE MEAN ALL WE SAY.—FULLY ESTABLISHED. Our circulation is 100,000. We are published every day except on Sundays and public holidays. It is sold by all news-vendors. Address: THE TRIBUNE COMPANY, 100 N. LAKE STREET, CHICAGO, ILL.

THE CHICAGO TRIBUNE.

WE MEAN ALL WE SAY.—FULLY ESTABLISHED. Our circulation is 100,000. We are published every day except on Sundays and public holidays. It is sold by all news-vendors. Address: THE TRIBUNE COMPANY, 100 N. LAKE STREET, CHICAGO, ILL.

THE CHICAGO TRIBUNE.

WE MEAN ALL WE SAY.—FULLY ESTABLISHED. Our circulation is 100,000. We are published every day except on Sundays and public holidays. It is sold by all news-vendors. Address: THE TRIBUNE COMPANY, 100 N. LAKE STREET, CHICAGO, ILL.

THE CHICAGO TRIBUNE.

WE MEAN ALL WE SAY.—FULLY ESTABLISHED. Our circulation is 100,000. We are published every day except on Sundays and public holidays. It is sold by all news-vendors. Address: THE TRIBUNE COMPANY, 100 N. LAKE STREET, CHICAGO, ILL.

THE CHICAGO TRIBUNE.

WE MEAN ALL WE SAY.—FULLY ESTABLISHED. Our circulation is 100,000. We are published every day except on Sundays and public holidays. It is sold by all news-vendors. Address: THE TRIBUNE COMPANY, 100 N. LAKE STREET, CHICAGO, ILL.

THE CHICAGO TRIBUNE.

WE MEAN ALL WE SAY.—FULLY ESTABLISHED. Our circulation is 100,000. We are published every day except on Sundays and public holidays. It is sold by all news-vendors. Address: THE TRIBUNE COMPANY, 100 N. LAKE STREET, CHICAGO, ILL.

THE CHICAGO TRIBUNE.

WE MEAN ALL WE SAY.—FULLY ESTABLISHED. Our circulation is 100,000. We are published every day except on Sundays and public holidays. It is sold by all news-vendors. Address: THE TRIBUNE COMPANY, 100 N. LAKE STREET, CHICAGO, ILL.

THE CHICAGO TRIBUNE.

WE MEAN ALL WE SAY.—FULLY ESTABLISHED. Our circulation is 100,000. We are published every day except on Sundays and public holidays. It is sold by all news-vendors. Address: THE TRIBUNE COMPANY, 100 N. LAKE STREET, CHICAGO, ILL.

THE CHICAGO TRIBUNE.

WE MEAN ALL WE SAY.—FULLY ESTABLISHED. Our circulation is 100,000. We are published every day except on Sundays and public holidays. It is sold by all news-vendors. Address: THE TRIBUNE COMPANY, 100 N. LAKE STREET, CHICAGO, ILL.

THE CHICAGO TRIBUNE.

WE MEAN ALL WE SAY.—FULLY ESTABLISHED. Our circulation is 100,000. We are published every day except on Sundays and public holidays. It is sold by all news-vendors. Address: THE TRIBUNE COMPANY, 100 N. LAKE STREET, CHICAGO, ILL.

THE CHICAGO TRIBUNE.

WE MEAN ALL WE SAY.—FULLY ESTABLISHED. Our circulation is 100,000. We are published every day except on Sundays and public holidays. It is sold by all news-vendors. Address: THE TRIBUNE COMPANY, 100 N. LAKE STREET, CHICAGO, ILL.

THE CHICAGO TRIBUNE.

WE MEAN ALL WE SAY.—FULLY ESTABLISHED. Our circulation is 100,000. We are published every day except on Sundays and public holidays. It is sold by all news-vendors. Address: THE TRIBUNE COMPANY, 100 N. LAKE STREET, CHICAGO, ILL.

make any objection to the Legislature because it has not passed 482 bills, or 432,000, or ten bills. It is not looking at the "quantitative value" at all, but at the fact that nothing of any value has been done; that not one bill, worth the price of the paper it is printed on, has been seriously considered. Up to this point nothing has been done, and over seven weeks of time and over \$100,000 of money have been squandered; that no law has been repealed and no defective laws have been amended; that the few obviously necessary bills have not been either matured or enacted; and that, so far as usefulness is concerned, the Legislature might as well never have met. If the outcome of this Reform Legislature is simply the adoption of a lot of trash—if it has not sense enough to distinguish between a political humbug started by the aephalous concern as a sensation and the legislation needed for the State—then it had better quit where it is and go home.

The appetite of the Centennial Commission for Government funds has been whetted by the \$500,000 appropriation voted by the House a few days ago. The Philadelphia House modestly asks for \$1,500,000 more. In support of this proposed grab at the revenues, at a time when taxes have to be increased in order to keep the Government running, it gravely represents: "It is a fact that the Government, while refusing to bear one dollar of the cost of the Exhibition, has yet taken the management wholly into its own hands, invited the guests, and laid out the money." This sounds like sarcasm, but the *Tribune* asserts it (we cannot insult its knowledge by saying it believes it) to be true. The Government has not taken the management into its hands; it has had nothing to do with the management; it has not even decided the nature of the show. Again, it has not invited one guest, much less all of them. On the contrary, Secretary Foster took the pains to issue a circular calling attention to the fact that the invitations were not given by the nation! And, finally, the Government has laid out precisely a cent of the money. The *Tribune's* "fact" is as false as its beggary is absurd. The people are taxed enough already for the benefit of Pennsylvania.

THE GENERAL CITY CHARTER.

We have received a copy of the bill now pending before the Legislature enacting a general incorporation law for cities. It does not amend or repeal the incorporation act of 1872, but creates a new act; and any city, by popular vote, may adopt the act of 1872, or that of 1875. As originally proposed, this bill contained a new system for the collection of taxes; but upon this point there was so much objection that all relating to that subject has been stricken out, and the bill now relates purely to a reorganization of the City Government.

Upon the petition of one-eighth of the voters of any city, the Common Council is required by resolution to submit to the voters of the city the question of "Reorganization under the general act of 1875," or "Against the same." If a majority shall vote "For" reorganization, the new charter, upon the declaration of such vote, shall go into operation, but all officers shall continue in office until their successors shall be elected. The record of the vote adopting the new charter shall be recorded in the office of the Recorder of Deeds. If this law be passed, a special election of the City Council will be held next August, and the general election for Mayor and other officers will take place in November, 1875. The ward of the city remains as now, with their number and boundaries unchanged.

GOD IN POLITICS.

The recent action of the North Carolina Legislature, published in another column, in expelling one of its members, Mr. J. W. Thoms, a sort of Quaker, on account of his alleged disbelief in the existence of God, and after other historical incidents in the same State, should commend North Carolina as a place of residence to the people who advocate the doctrine generally known as "God in the Constitution," but which might be more accurately defined as "God in the Politics." Up to the year 1848 the God in the North Carolina Constitution was not only a Christian God, but also a Protestant God. Under the organic law of the State up to that period, all persons who denied "the truth of the Protestant religion" were excluded from holding office. This provision excluded Catholics and Jews, as well as Deists, Atheists, and Infidels. In the Constitution of 1848 the political notion of Deity was modified, and the new restriction was limited to a general belief in God; this idea was retained in the new Constitution of 1868, which has a clause disqualifying from holding office, "First, all persons who shall deny the being of Almighty God." This general disqualification, however, seems to be subject to the special interpretation of the Legislature; for Mr. Thoms was expelled on the ground of disbelief in the being of Almighty God, though he made the following explicit declaration of faith in his speech before the Legislature: "There is one living and true God; everlasting, without body, or passions; of unchangeable power, wisdom, and goodness; the maker of all things, visible and invisible." To a layman and non-believer in the doctrine of "God in Politics," this would seem to be a sufficiently strong declaration of belief in Almighty God to warrant a man, otherwise unobjectionable, in holding a seat in the Legislature to which he had been chosen by the suffrages of the people. In addition to this declaration, Mr. Thoms also presented a number of letters showing that he was a member of good standing in the Progressive Order of Friends, a sect of Quakers; that he had been a Trustee in the church of that Society in Pennsylvania, his former home; and that he was a man of good moral character. But he had written a pamphlet in which he had spoken of the Trinity and Resurrection as mythical or superstitious, and said that he did not regard God as a Being whose chief purpose is to torture mankind after death. He also stated in the presence of the Legislature that, while he believed in God, he did not believe "in all the characteristics attributed to Him." Thereupon a member declared that it was clear Thoms did not believe in the "God of our Constitution," and it was on this ground that Mr. Thoms was expelled by a majority vote of the House sitting as an Ecclesiastical Court.

From this instance it is plain that when God is introduced into politics it is necessary to define exactly what kind of a being is intended. It is doubtful whether a Jew, or Unitarian, or even a Universalist, could pass muster in the North Carolina Legislature. That, suppose some future Legislature should interpret the attributes of God to be all those believed in by the Quaker Thoms.

THE CHICAGO TRIBUNE.

WE MEAN ALL WE SAY.—FULLY ESTABLISHED. Our circulation is 100,000. We are published every day except on Sundays and public holidays. It is sold by all news-vendors. Address: THE TRIBUNE COMPANY, 100 N. LAKE STREET, CHICAGO, ILL.

THE CHICAGO TRIBUNE.

WE MEAN ALL WE SAY.—FULLY ESTABLISHED. Our circulation is 100,000. We are published every day except on Sundays and public holidays. It is sold by all news-vendors. Address: THE TRIBUNE COMPANY, 100 N. LAKE STREET, CHICAGO, ILL.

THE CHICAGO TRIBUNE.

WE MEAN ALL WE SAY.—FULLY ESTABLISHED. Our circulation is 100,000. We are published every day except on Sundays and public holidays. It is sold by all news-vendors. Address: THE TRIBUNE COMPANY, 100 N. LAKE STREET, CHICAGO, ILL.

THE CHICAGO TRIBUNE.

WE MEAN ALL WE SAY.—FULLY ESTABLISHED. Our circulation is 100,000. We are published every day except on Sundays and public holidays. It is sold by all news-vendors. Address: THE TRIBUNE COMPANY, 100 N. LAKE STREET, CHICAGO, ILL.

THE CHICAGO TRIBUNE.

WE MEAN ALL WE SAY.—FULLY ESTABLISHED. Our circulation is 100,000. We are published every day except on Sundays and public holidays. It is sold by all news-vendors. Address: THE TRIBUNE COMPANY, 100 N. LAKE STREET, CHICAGO, ILL.

In case of a vacancy in the office, if the unexpired term be less than six months, the President of the Board of Councilors shall become Mayor.

All officers not elected by the people are to be appointed by the Mayor, with the approval of the Board of Councilors. They may be removed by the Mayor for cause, provided two-thirds of the Board of Councilors approve the same.

The only new feature in relation to the Treasurer is that, in addition to a monthly report of the amount of money on hand, he shall state where the same is deposited. The City Clerk, with assistants, is to be Clerk to the two Boards of the Common Council. The Commissioner of Police is to have entire charge of that department; the Commissioner of Public Works and the Commissioners of Fire and Health are in the same manner made heads of their respective departments, respectively of the action of their subordinates. The Commissioner of Police is to appoint his subordinates, and, for cause, may remove them; his action is final and no appeal is allowed. The same rule of discipline is established in the Fire Department.

Such are the general provisions of the new charter which have been substantially agreed upon at Springfield, and have been accepted by all those who have participated in the preparation of amendments. We have no hesitation in expressing a hope that all the members of the Cook County delegation will unite in giving it their cordial support. There is nothing partisan in the bill. It is not in the interest of one party or the other, but is in the interest of good government and responsible government. We understand that the Democratic members of the Cook County delegation have waived all opposition to this measure of reform, and we are certain that the Republican members can as readily support any measure that promises to bring order out of disorder and establish responsibility where there is none. The City of Chicago, with a population exceeding that of any one of a dozen States of the Union, with an annual treasury three times that of the State of Illinois, has no executive authority. The executive functions are divided among a number of departments, each independent of the other, and not responsible to any. Each transacts its own business as if it were an exclusive government. The new charter does establish a responsible executive government. Each department is responsible to a joint authority of all the other departments. There can be no secrecy or ring operation in any branch of the City Government. Every expenditure of over \$500 must be authorized by the approval of the Mayor and of the heads of the other departments, and be a matter of record. This one feature of reform is sufficient of itself to commend the whole charter to public approval. The establishment of two Boards is, we think, another great improvement; it will be an additional check on hasty and imprudent legislation. It destroys the absolute power of any one branch of the City Government. The mode of election of the members of these two branches of the City Legislature places it within the power of the conservative portion of the people to elect a strong representation of able, intelligent, and respectable citizens to each Board.

The bill breaks up the present organization of the City Government; it dissolves all the irresponsible Boards; it gets the administration of city affairs out of the old ruts in which it has been run so long, and into which it is sinking deeper every day. The city will shake off its old garments, and be clothed anew, to the great improvement of its operations and to the great saving of expenses.

GOD IN POLITICS.

The recent action of the North Carolina Legislature, published in another column, in expelling one of its members, Mr. J. W. Thoms, a sort of Quaker, on account of his alleged disbelief in the existence of God, and after other historical incidents in the same State, should commend North Carolina as a place of residence to the people who advocate the doctrine generally known as "God in the Constitution," but which might be more accurately defined as "God in the Politics." Up to the year 1848 the God in the North Carolina Constitution was not only a Christian God, but also a Protestant God. Under the organic law of the State up to that period, all persons who denied "the truth of the Protestant religion" were excluded from holding office. This provision excluded Catholics and Jews, as well as Deists, Atheists, and Infidels. In the Constitution of 1848 the political notion of Deity was modified, and the new restriction was limited to a general belief in God; this idea was retained in the new Constitution of 1868, which has a clause disqualifying from holding office, "First, all persons who shall deny the being of Almighty God." This general disqualification, however, seems to be subject to the special interpretation of the Legislature; for Mr. Thoms was expelled on the ground of disbelief in the being of Almighty God, though he made the following explicit declaration of faith in his speech before the Legislature: "There is one living and true God; everlasting, without body, or passions; of unchangeable power, wisdom, and goodness; the maker of all things, visible and invisible." To a layman and non-believer in the doctrine of "God in Politics," this would seem to be a sufficiently strong declaration of belief in Almighty God to warrant a man, otherwise unobjectionable, in holding a seat in the Legislature to which he had been chosen by the suffrages of the people. In addition to this declaration, Mr. Thoms also presented a number of letters showing that he was a member of good standing in the Progressive Order of Friends, a sect of Quakers; that he had been a Trustee in the church of that Society in Pennsylvania, his former home; and that he was a man of good moral character. But he had written a pamphlet in which he had spoken of the Trinity and Resurrection as mythical or superstitious, and said that he did not regard God as a Being whose chief purpose is to torture mankind after death. He also stated in the presence of the Legislature that, while he believed in God, he did not believe "in all the characteristics attributed to Him." Thereupon a member declared that it was clear Thoms did not believe in the "God of our Constitution," and it was on this ground that Mr. Thoms was expelled by a majority vote of the House sitting as an Ecclesiastical Court.

GOD IN POLITICS.

The recent action of the North Carolina Legislature, published in another column, in expelling one of its members, Mr. J. W. Thoms, a sort of Quaker, on account of his alleged disbelief in the existence of God, and after other historical incidents in the same State, should commend North Carolina as a place of residence to the people who advocate the doctrine generally known as "God in the Constitution," but which might be more accurately defined as "God in the Politics." Up to the year 1848 the God in the North Carolina Constitution was not only a Christian God, but also a Protestant God. Under the organic law of the State up to that period, all persons who denied "the truth of the Protestant religion" were excluded from holding office. This provision excluded Catholics and Jews, as well as Deists, Atheists, and Infidels. In the Constitution of 1848 the political notion of Deity was modified, and the new restriction was limited to a general belief in God; this idea was retained in the new Constitution of 1868, which has a clause disqualifying from holding office, "First, all persons who shall deny the being of Almighty God." This general disqualification, however, seems to be subject to the special interpretation of the Legislature; for Mr. Thoms was expelled on the ground of disbelief in the being of Almighty God, though he made the following explicit declaration of faith in his speech before the Legislature: "There is one living and true God; everlasting, without body, or passions; of unchangeable power, wisdom, and goodness; the maker of all things, visible and invisible." To a layman and non-believer in the doctrine of "God in Politics," this would seem to be a sufficiently strong declaration of belief in Almighty God to warrant a man, otherwise unobjectionable, in holding a seat in the Legislature to which he had been chosen by the suffrages of the people. In addition to this declaration, Mr. Thoms also presented a number of letters showing that he was a member of good standing in the Progressive Order of Friends, a sect of Quakers; that he had been a Trustee in the church of that Society in Pennsylvania, his former home; and that he was a man of good moral character. But he had written a pamphlet in which he had spoken of the Trinity and Resurrection as mythical or superstitious, and said that he did not regard God as a Being whose chief purpose is to torture mankind after death. He also stated in the presence of the Legislature that, while he believed in God, he did not believe "in all the characteristics attributed to Him." Thereupon a member declared that it was clear Thoms did not believe in the "God of our Constitution," and it was on this ground that Mr. Thoms was expelled by a majority vote of the House sitting as an Ecclesiastical Court.

GOD IN POLITICS.

The recent action of the North Carolina Legislature, published in another column, in expelling one of its members, Mr. J. W. Thoms, a sort of Quaker, on account of his alleged disbelief in the existence of God, and after other historical incidents in the same State, should commend North Carolina as a place of residence to the people who advocate the doctrine generally known as "God in the Constitution," but which might be more accurately defined as "God in the Politics." Up to the year 1848 the God in the North Carolina Constitution was not only a Christian God, but also a Protestant God. Under the organic law of the State up to that period, all persons who denied "the truth of the Protestant religion" were excluded from holding office. This provision excluded Catholics and Jews, as well as Deists, Atheists, and Infidels. In the Constitution of 1848 the political notion of Deity was modified, and the new restriction was limited to a general belief in God; this idea was retained in the new Constitution of 1868, which has a clause disqualifying from holding office, "First, all persons who shall deny the being of Almighty God." This general disqualification, however, seems to be subject to the special interpretation of the Legislature; for Mr. Thoms was expelled on the ground of disbelief in the being of Almighty God, though he made the following explicit declaration of faith in his speech before the Legislature: "There is one living and true God; everlasting, without body, or passions; of unchangeable power, wisdom, and goodness; the maker of all things, visible and invisible." To a layman and non-believer in the doctrine of "God in Politics," this would seem to be a sufficiently strong declaration of belief in Almighty God to warrant a man, otherwise unobjectionable, in holding a seat in the Legislature to which he had been chosen by the suffrages of the people. In addition to this declaration, Mr. Thoms also presented a number of letters showing that he was a member of good standing in the Progressive Order of Friends, a sect of Quakers; that he had been a Trustee in the church of that Society in Pennsylvania, his former home; and that he was a man of good moral character. But he had written a pamphlet in which he had spoken of the Trinity and Resurrection as mythical or superstitious, and said that he did not regard God as a Being whose chief purpose is to torture mankind after death. He also stated in the presence of the Legislature that, while he believed in God, he did not believe "in all the characteristics attributed to Him." Thereupon a member declared that it was clear Thoms did not believe in the "God of our Constitution," and it was on this ground that Mr. Thoms was expelled by a majority vote of the House sitting as an Ecclesiastical Court.

GOD IN POLITICS.

The recent action of the North Carolina Legislature, published in another column, in expelling one of its members, Mr. J. W. Thoms, a sort of Quaker, on account of his alleged disbelief in the existence of God, and after other historical incidents in the same State, should commend North Carolina as a place of residence to the people who advocate the doctrine generally known as "God in the Constitution," but which might be more accurately defined as "God in the Politics." Up to the year 1848 the God in the North Carolina Constitution was not only a Christian God, but also a Protestant God. Under the organic law of the State up to that period, all persons who denied "the truth of the Protestant religion" were excluded from holding office. This provision excluded Catholics and Jews, as well as Deists, Atheists, and Infidels. In the Constitution of 1848 the political notion of Deity was modified, and the new restriction was limited to a general belief in God; this idea was retained in the new Constitution of 1868, which has a clause disqualifying from holding office, "First, all persons who shall deny the being of Almighty God." This general disqualification, however, seems to be subject to the special interpretation of the Legislature; for Mr. Thoms was expelled on the ground of disbelief in the being of Almighty God, though he made the following explicit declaration of faith in his speech before the Legislature: "There is one living and true God; everlasting, without body, or passions; of unchangeable power, wisdom, and goodness; the maker of all things, visible and invisible." To a layman and non-believer in the doctrine of "God in Politics," this would seem to be a sufficiently strong declaration of belief in Almighty God to warrant a man, otherwise unobjectionable, in holding a seat in the Legislature to which he had been chosen by the suffrages of the people. In addition to this declaration, Mr. Thoms also presented a number of letters showing that he was a member of good standing in the Progressive Order of Friends, a sect of Quakers; that he had been a Trustee in the church of that Society in Pennsylvania, his former home; and that he was a man of good moral character. But he had written a pamphlet in which he had spoken of the Trinity and Resurrection as mythical or superstitious, and said that he did not regard God as a Being whose chief purpose is to torture mankind after death. He also stated in the presence of the Legislature that, while he believed in God, he did not believe "in all the characteristics attributed to Him." Thereupon a member declared that it was clear Thoms did not believe in the "God of our Constitution," and it was on this ground that Mr. Thoms was expelled by a majority vote of the House sitting as an Ecclesiastical Court.

GOD IN POLITICS.

The recent action of the North Carolina Legislature, published in another column, in expelling one of its members, Mr. J. W. Thoms, a sort of Quaker, on account of his alleged disbelief in the existence of God, and after other historical incidents in the same State, should commend North Carolina as a place of residence to the people who advocate the doctrine generally known as "God in the Constitution," but which might be more accurately defined as "God in the Politics." Up to the year 1848 the God in the North Carolina Constitution was not only a Christian God, but also a Protestant God. Under the organic law of the State up to that period, all persons who denied "the truth of the Protestant religion" were excluded from holding office. This provision excluded Catholics and Jews, as well as Deists, Atheists, and Infidels. In the Constitution of 1848 the political notion of Deity was modified, and the new restriction was limited to a general belief in God; this idea was retained in the new Constitution of 1868, which has a clause disqualifying from holding office, "First, all persons who shall deny the being of Almighty God." This general disqualification, however, seems to be subject to the special interpretation of the Legislature; for Mr. Thoms was expelled on the ground of disbelief in the being of Almighty God, though he made the following explicit declaration of faith in his speech before the Legislature: "There is one living and true God; everlasting, without body, or passions; of unchangeable power, wisdom, and goodness; the maker of all things, visible and invisible." To a layman and non-believer in the doctrine of "God in Politics," this would seem to be a sufficiently strong declaration of belief in Almighty God to warrant a man, otherwise unobjectionable, in holding a seat in the Legislature to which he had been chosen by the suffrages of the people. In addition to this declaration, Mr. Thoms also presented a number of letters showing that he was a member of good standing in the Progressive Order of Friends, a sect of Quakers; that he had been a Trustee in the church of that Society in Pennsylvania, his former home; and that he was a man of good moral character. But he had written a pamphlet in which he had spoken of the Trinity and Resurrection as mythical or superstitious, and said that he did not regard God as a Being whose chief purpose is to torture mankind after death. He also stated in the presence of the Legislature that, while he believed in God, he did not believe "in all the characteristics attributed to Him." Thereupon a member declared that it was clear Thoms did not believe in the "God of our Constitution," and it was on this ground that Mr. Thoms was expelled by a majority vote of the House sitting as an Ecclesiastical Court.

GOD IN POLITICS.

The recent action of the North Carolina Legislature, published in another column, in expelling one of its members, Mr. J. W. Thoms, a sort of Quaker, on account of his alleged disbelief in the existence of God, and after other historical incidents in the same State, should commend North Carolina as a place of residence to the people who advocate the doctrine generally known as "God in the Constitution," but which might be more accurately defined as "God in the Politics." Up to the year 1848 the God in the North Carolina Constitution was not only a Christian God, but also a Protestant God. Under the organic law of the State up to that period, all persons who denied "the truth of the Protestant religion" were excluded from holding office. This provision excluded Catholics and Jews, as well as Deists, Atheists, and Infidels. In the Constitution of 1848 the political notion of Deity was modified, and the new restriction was limited to a general belief in God; this idea was retained in the new Constitution of 1868, which has a clause disqualifying from holding office, "First, all persons who shall deny the being of Almighty God." This general disqualification, however, seems to be subject to the special interpretation of the Legislature; for Mr. Thoms was expelled on the ground of disbelief in the being of Almighty God, though he made the following explicit declaration of faith in his speech before the Legislature: "There is one living and true God; everlasting, without body, or passions; of unchangeable power, wisdom, and goodness; the maker of all things, visible and invisible." To a layman and non-believer in the doctrine of "God in Politics," this would seem to be a sufficiently strong declaration of belief in Almighty God to warrant a man, otherwise unobjectionable, in holding a seat in the Legislature to which he had been chosen by the suffrages of the people. In addition to this declaration, Mr. Thoms also presented a number of letters showing that he was a member of good standing in the Progressive Order of Friends, a sect of Quakers; that he had been a Trustee in the church of that Society in Pennsylvania, his former home; and that he was a man of good moral character. But he had written a pamphlet in which he had spoken of the Trinity and Resurrection as mythical or superstitious, and said that he did not regard God as a Being whose chief purpose is to torture mankind after death. He also stated in the presence of the Legislature that, while he believed in God, he did not believe "in all the characteristics attributed to Him." Thereupon a member declared that it was clear Thoms did not believe in the "God of our Constitution," and it was on this ground that Mr. Thoms was expelled by a majority vote of the House sitting as an Ecclesiastical Court.

GOD IN POLITICS.

The recent action of the North Carolina Legislature, published in another column, in expelling one of its members, Mr. J. W. Thoms, a sort of Quaker, on account of his alleged disbelief in the existence of God, and after other historical incidents in the same State, should commend North Carolina as a place of residence to the people who advocate the doctrine generally known as "God in the Constitution," but which might be more accurately defined as "God in the Politics." Up to the year 1848 the God in the North Carolina Constitution was not only a Christian God, but also a Protestant God. Under the organic law of the State up to that period, all persons who denied "the truth of the Protestant religion" were excluded from holding office. This provision excluded Catholics and Jews, as well as Deists, Atheists, and Infidels. In the Constitution of 1848 the political notion of Deity was modified, and the new restriction was limited to a general belief in God; this idea was retained in the new Constitution of 1868, which has a clause disqualifying from holding office, "First, all persons who shall deny the being of Almighty God." This general disqualification, however, seems to be subject to the special interpretation of the Legislature; for Mr. Thoms was expelled on the ground of disbelief in the being of Almighty God, though he made the following explicit declaration of faith in his speech before the Legislature: "There is one living and true God; everlasting, without body, or passions; of unchangeable power, wisdom, and goodness; the maker of all things, visible and invisible." To a layman and non-believer in the doctrine of "God in Politics," this would seem to be a sufficiently strong declaration of belief in Almighty God to warrant a man, otherwise unobjectionable, in holding a seat in the Legislature to which he had been chosen by the suffrages of the people. In addition to this declaration, Mr. Thoms also presented a number of letters showing that he was a member of good standing in the Progressive Order of Friends, a sect of Quakers; that he had been a Trustee in the church of that Society in Pennsylvania, his former home; and that he was a man of good moral character. But he had written a pamphlet in which he had spoken of the Trinity and Resurrection as mythical or superstitious, and said that he did not regard God as a Being whose chief purpose is to torture mankind after death. He also stated in the presence of the Legislature that, while he believed in God, he did not believe "in all the characteristics attributed to Him." Thereupon a member declared that it was clear Thoms did not believe in the "God of our Constitution," and it was on this ground that Mr. Thoms was expelled by a majority vote of the House sitting as an Ecclesiastical Court.

GOD IN POLITICS.

The recent action of the North Carolina Legislature, published in another column, in expelling one of its members, Mr. J. W. Thoms, a sort of Quaker, on account of his alleged disbelief in the existence of God, and after other historical incidents in the same State, should commend North Carolina as a place of residence to the people who advocate the doctrine generally known as "God in the Constitution," but which might be more accurately defined as "God in the Politics." Up to the year 1848 the God in the North Carolina Constitution was not only a Christian God, but also a Protestant

ble, as being out of the confidence of the wife,
and the letter and copy had been destroyed.

Mr. Evarts then moved to strike out this evidence on the ground that it would disparage the

Judge Neilson refused this, and an exception

THE MEETING AT MOULTON'S. On the 3d of January I went to Moulton's, and shortly after, Beecher entered the room. Moulton said I should not refuse to speak to him in his house. I replied, "How could I do so, knowing he had ruined my wife?" Moulton said, "How could you act to a man who humbled himself before you as before his God?" I then said, "Good morning." Mr. Beecher said, "I do not put in any plea for myself. If you wish me to retire."

from the pulpit, only say the word, and I will leave. There will be no selling of pews, and I will go out of public life. I will leave you out of life by suicide or journey to some other part of the world." "My wife," said Beecher, "ought never to know this, for, in addition to becoming your enemy, she should also become mine." He said the relation between himself and Elizabeth was not always marked by sexual intercourse, and he could not offer any excuse for himself. He asked me to believe that he had not sought her for selfish purposes, and that the intercourse was from motives of love and affection. I said that I did not know, and he said he never loved. He asked me if I could reinstate him in my love and esteem, and drew a picture of a man sitting on a brink, and said that he was you.

THE EDGE OF HELL.
I remember Beecher said something which led him into a violent burst of grief. During the conversation with Moulton, which witness did not hear, Beecher appeared overcome with grief. Moulton requested witness to leave them together, and he did so.

ANOTHER INTERVIEW.
A few days after this interview, Moulton sent for me. Beecher was present. The latter which had written to Bowen, dated last of January, was read. Beecher had been in the fort for

reference to some consultation about this letter. Moulton read it aloud, and told Beecher I had written it, thinking that I must make some explanation to the public about the termination of the appointments. He said that the resignation was announced in the papers by Bowen that was to be editor of the Brooklyn Union, and contributor to the Independent, and that these appointments had for some reason been terminated. He said that he was not informed of the reason of these changes. Beecher said that so far as the charges of Bowen were concerned that he did not care about any that he (Bowen) could make. He said he also said that he was not in any way guilty of the charges made by Bowen against him, and that he had never committed any violence on any woman. The interview ended by Moulton asking me to call on him some time, and we talk with Beecher after he has left.

KISSED TILTON ON THE FOREHEAD.

I remember shortly after this Moonlight was ill; went to see him. Beecher was there. He said: Frank is very sick; he is at the grave's edge, all afraid he will die, and what will then become of our case? Frank has saved me. So saying he kissed me on the forehead and retired.

THE MORRIS LETTER.

I had another interview with him, either at the close of that month or the beginning of the next. I was sent for to Moonlight's who had then recovered, and it took place in his house. Beecher was then present. Moonlight held in his hand a letter which Beecher had received from Mrs. Morris. Beecher had received the letter, and it was in relation to that, since he was considering the letter.

and been sent for. [Shown a copy of letter, which witnesses identified]. The letter charged me with telling twelve persons about Deenear's charges against Elizabeth, and that these persons were to tell twelve more. Mrs. Moulton also said that I had not money to buy my family food. I turned to Moulton and said, "You know I have no money." Moulton then said I told twelve persons of the charges, and I re-plied that I had not. I told him that Mrs. Moulton had said that I had told twelve persons. Theodore was making such and such charges against Elizabeth, and that these charges were to be told to twelve persons. I told him that the only persons informed on the subject were Oliver Johnson, Mrs. Martha Brad-ber, and Francis D. Moulton. Deenear asked me if I had told twelve persons of the charges, and I told him that I had told twelve persons, and I told him that in the previous summer I had told stories to his detriment. Moulton then said that the charges against Deenear occurred before Moulton came in to keep the peace between us. I told him

Mrs. MORSE was a LARGESIZED WOMAN; she was about 5 feet 10 inches tall, and her cresting gray hair and face were like her, and she was about 60 years of age. She was a very violent in her manners and utterances. A letter was prepared by Beecher in reply to this letter from Mrs. Morse, in which he told her that he was not going to appear at the trial. During that interview I exhibited the letter which was sent to Mr. Dowse by Mrs. Morse, and I also showed her the letter which I had received of the kind of letters Mrs. Morse was in the habit of sending. Beecher asked me what I had to say in reply to the letter from Mrs. Morse. The letter of Mrs. Morse was offered in evidence, and Mr. Evans objected to it as from that party. It was finally, after a brief discussion, admitted in evidence. The witness continued: I was the bearer of a letter from Mrs. Tibbitts from Mr. Beecher at the time that I was in the city. I showed Mrs. Tibbitts a letter to Mrs. Tibbitts with his

Monkton's consent. [This letter, to the position of Monkton as one of the eleven judges of the court, was signed by Mr. Everts. The Court ruled to let the matter stand for the present, and witness went home.] I cannot recollect the date of the letters, but I think it was about the 17th of February.

THE NEXT INTERVIEW

The Recorder after this was before Monkton went to his office at 10 o'clock. He asked if I would permit Deeder to write to Mr. Monkton, and said that Deeder could not as he had no money. I thought I received the letter at the end of March. Monkton adjourned.

—♦—

TUESDAY'S PROCEEDINGS.

COURT-ROOM SCENES.

DEPARTED BY DR. STENZ.

Recent Dispatch From The Chicago Tribune.

SARATOGA, N. Y., Feb. 26.—The trial of the case of Dr. Stenz vs. the People has been adjourned until the 28th inst. because of the illness of the defendant.

Deeher, that of to-day must have been a more exquisite pain. The threshold only Tilton's story was crossed yesterday, and to the world was shown from chamber to chamber in his house of horrors. As air of almost unbearable solicitude pervaded the room, the speaker's face was pale and his voice trembled.

He looked like a State criminal arraigned for high treason: He never smiled; talked little; wrote none at all; and was evidently the object of a hundred conflicting emotions. Mrs. Tilton had a hectic flush on her cheeks, — the token of a quietly smothered fever; her eyes glanced at her husband's misery stoically.

Gen. Tracy was absent, engaged, it is said, in preparing the opening speech for the defense.

THE COURT JOINTLY.

The proceedings to-day were much enlivened by the presence of the following officers:

Upon his face, and his wig glistened with marked annoyance. The Judge regarded with the ludicrous result of Everts' unfortunate allusion to the Count in yesterday's proceedings. The noble George delivered himself of a characteristically extravagant speech, in which Beecher, Everts, Porter, and the Judge himself were all claimed as personal friends, and among which Beecher entered. The Count's amazement was much puzzled by the great appearance, that distinguished member of the nobility being a stranger to him.

There was a deadly hush when the witness, in a jerky voice, unfolded the history of the first meeting with Beecher to decide the question of little Ralph's legitimacy. A cynical smile, if it can be so called, possessed his face as the details of that unparalleled interview were related. Beecher looked pained and ashamed and anguish, a crimson flush suffused his features, and he sat bolt upright in

to Beescher or not. I do not want either party to come to my house to see what had been the result of the correspondence. I was out Saturday night after I had been for in leaving I had left them together in the morning. I am the pastor of the Epist. prepared by Beescher, is to the publication of the fratricide again. I have no objection to the continued slander that have for some fellow. I have no objection to the recent publication of a document which is a copy of the correspondence in consultation with either Theodore or myself, or our authorization. If the publication of the correspondence of the excommunicate to which I alluded, or the publication of the correspondence of the course towards me has been the result of the correspondence.

HENRY WADSWORTH

Witness, conducted Beescher to the house of the excommunicate, and seeing to raise trouble there. I remember that he was very angry, and was going to institute charges against me and he wanted to know what I had to say. I told him that I suggested to the tract charge, with a view to the same. He said that the vacation was upon the 1st of August, and that he would be in the city at that time.

[illegible][illegible][illegible]

trinal in order to escape the reality of the situation. I am glad that we have never spoken against Mr. Beecher for that reason, either on the Church Commission or in the House of Representatives. In my position once again, I will do so only if I am convinced that the answer before the House is a just one. I am convinced that Theodore Tilton was spoken against because he was a man of great integrity and because Mr. Beecher before the action of the Commission was a man of great integrity. The matter is solely with a view to the future that I feel it is my duty to speak out. I feel it is my duty to speak out in the possibility of mine to Theodore Tilton. I feel it is my duty to speak out in the possibility of mine to Theodore Tilton. I feel it is my duty to speak out in the possibility of mine to Theodore Tilton.

[illegible]

in the possession of the defendants, and were in the possession of the other two times they became personal property and lived to him by the defendants. He was acquitted under this ruling, being guilty of trespass on real property.

Death of the \$35,000 Cow.
From the *Perry Post-Examiner*.
On Saturday last the Fourth Purchase died at the Hon. T. J. Mcgibben's. She was owned by H. G. Bedford, who resided at Campbell's New York Mills sale, for she leaves a fine bull calf, 3-months-old, and a fine cow, 10-months-old, and the finest Dutch in the country. There came an insurance on the cow, and the insurer had the same fate as the \$50,000 Mr. A. G. Bedford has been parsimoniously paying, having possession last five months.

know.
alton's
of Mr.
on on
houses.
Moul-
editor
elation
ent;
under
me. I
The
beats
without
Tillem
ement
author
y other
s. Til-
man of

piled
 anger,
 And
 waited
 charges
 for this
 and he
 as case
 depend-
 ed soon
 at West
 mining
 guilty
 Com-
 sum-
 onged.
 of the
 is, and
 the
 earth
 that I
 secured
 mber-
 re, if
 ved;"
 must
 in the
 mem-
 oried.
 (Lab-

er was
nouse.
in his.
write
Beech-
ngence
paper.
ch. I
ice —
aid he
gred
er to o
; but
st; I
se of
I not
he
f you
is in-
night
this
and
ex-
know
spoke
t, and
him I
e that
ed the
o be

meanly them
that I
d me
a R.
could
I told
I told
a put
d by
that I
Mr.
He
and I
unmit-
terly:—
her:—
of Mr.
of the
w co-
to put
sly as
sly: I
t
never
t with
any
here,
name
enfore,
used to
dering
that I

lity
 rest, I
 and,
 all re-
 take
 mber
 at
 abled
 you,
 Ward
 ear to
 ce to-
 this
 roach
 on in
 it re-
 main a
 Fra-
 on.
 into
 into.
 end,
 the
 inons
 nited
 lions
 sub-
 alms
 sewer
 was
 my
 I
 and I
 s to

was
Mr.
had
me.
that
er to
ber,
a
did
ned
but
d it
here
much

ver
 lin
 di-
 by
 ply

 di-
 ue
 77A
 001
 by
 of
 of
 004
 m
 a

[illegible]

VOLUME 29.

THE BEECHER TRIAL.

TUESDAY.

Special Dispatch to The Chicago Tribune.

BROOKLYN, N. Y., Feb. 8.—There was a very perceptible falling off in the attendance today. The weather had nothing to do with it, for it was calm, bright, and clear. There was no circus up-town to draw competition, and there was no fire down-town to draw people out of doors.

The trial of the Beecher case was resumed this morning. The jury, who were sworn in yesterday, were called upon to return a verdict. The case was heard by Judge Woodworth, who presided over the trial.

The case was heard by Judge Woodworth, who presided over the trial. The jury, who were sworn in yesterday, were called upon to return a verdict. The case was heard by Judge Woodworth, who presided over the trial.

The case was heard by Judge Woodworth, who presided over the trial. The jury, who were sworn in yesterday, were called upon to return a verdict. The case was heard by Judge Woodworth, who presided over the trial.

The case was heard by Judge Woodworth, who presided over the trial. The jury, who were sworn in yesterday, were called upon to return a verdict. The case was heard by Judge Woodworth, who presided over the trial.

The case was heard by Judge Woodworth, who presided over the trial. The jury, who were sworn in yesterday, were called upon to return a verdict. The case was heard by Judge Woodworth, who presided over the trial.

The case was heard by Judge Woodworth, who presided over the trial. The jury, who were sworn in yesterday, were called upon to return a verdict. The case was heard by Judge Woodworth, who presided over the trial.

The case was heard by Judge Woodworth, who presided over the trial. The jury, who were sworn in yesterday, were called upon to return a verdict. The case was heard by Judge Woodworth, who presided over the trial.

The case was heard by Judge Woodworth, who presided over the trial. The jury, who were sworn in yesterday, were called upon to return a verdict. The case was heard by Judge Woodworth, who presided over the trial.

The case was heard by Judge Woodworth, who presided over the trial. The jury, who were sworn in yesterday, were called upon to return a verdict. The case was heard by Judge Woodworth, who presided over the trial.

The case was heard by Judge Woodworth, who presided over the trial. The jury, who were sworn in yesterday, were called upon to return a verdict. The case was heard by Judge Woodworth, who presided over the trial.

The case was heard by Judge Woodworth, who presided over the trial. The jury, who were sworn in yesterday, were called upon to return a verdict. The case was heard by Judge Woodworth, who presided over the trial.

The case was heard by Judge Woodworth, who presided over the trial. The jury, who were sworn in yesterday, were called upon to return a verdict. The case was heard by Judge Woodworth, who presided over the trial.

The case was heard by Judge Woodworth, who presided over the trial. The jury, who were sworn in yesterday, were called upon to return a verdict. The case was heard by Judge Woodworth, who presided over the trial.

that that note was surrendered. Mr. Bowen

wanted back some of the papers, but I won't

certain whether this was one of them.

Q.—You received on the 15th of December?

A.—Yes, sir, I did. In the evening. Perhaps I

ought to mention that a few days before that I

had a quarrelsome and angry interview with Mr.

Bowen, in which he stated that, if ever I did

certain thing, he would drag me where I am.

Q.—Did you, prior to this interview, with Mr.

Bowen, ever have any conversation with him

concerning your employment or continued to be

employed on those contracts? A.—No, sir, none

whatsoever. I had an interview with Mr. Bowen

on the morning of Dec. 26, but it was not in

reference to any termination of my contract, or

anything in the shape of any business arrange-

ment. It was an interview of my own making.

Q.—And did not relate to anything of your

personal scandalous conduct, as Mr. Bowen

stated? A.—No, sir, it did not. Somebody had

been talking to Mr. Bowen about me, and I

went to see him to see what he had to say

about it. He said that he had no objection to

my going to the trial, and that he would

be glad to see me. He said that he would

be glad to see me. He said that he would

be glad to see me. He said that he would

be glad to see me. He said that he would

be glad to see me. He said that he would

be glad to see me. He said that he would

be glad to see me. He said that he would

be glad to see me. He said that he would

be glad to see me. He said that he would

be glad to see me. He said that he would

be glad to see me. He said that he would

be glad to see me. He said that he would

be glad to see me. He said that he would

be glad to see me. He said that he would

be glad to see me. He said that he would

be glad to see me. He said that he would

be glad to see me. He said that he would

be glad to see me. He said that he would

be glad to see me. He said that he would

be glad to see me. He said that he would

what Mr. Beecher's relations had been to Mr.

Tilton, and asked:

Q.—After Mr. Johnson had gone away? A.—

Yes, after Mr. Johnson had gone away. A—

Yes, after Mr. Johnson had gone away. A—

Yes, after Mr. Johnson had gone away. A—

Yes, after Mr. Johnson had gone away. A—

Yes, after Mr. Johnson had gone away. A—

Yes, after Mr. Johnson had gone away. A—

Yes, after Mr. Johnson had gone away. A—

Yes, after Mr. Johnson had gone away. A—

Yes, after Mr. Johnson had gone away. A—

Yes, after Mr. Johnson had gone away. A—

Yes, after Mr. Johnson had gone away. A—

Yes, after Mr. Johnson had gone away. A—

Yes, after Mr. Johnson had gone away. A—

Yes, after Mr. Johnson had gone away. A—

Yes, after Mr. Johnson had gone away. A—

Yes, after Mr. Johnson had gone away. A—

Yes, after Mr. Johnson had gone away. A—

Yes, after Mr. Johnson had gone away. A—

Yes, after Mr. Johnson had gone away. A—

Yes, after Mr. Johnson had gone away. A—

Yes, after Mr. Johnson had gone away. A—

Yes, after Mr. Johnson had gone away. A—

Yes, after Mr. Johnson had gone away. A—

Yes, after Mr. Johnson had gone away. A—

Yes, after Mr. Johnson had gone away. A—

Yes, after Mr. Johnson had gone away. A—

Yes, after Mr. Johnson had gone away. A—

Yes, after Mr. Johnson had gone away. A—

Yes, after Mr. Johnson had gone away. A—

Yes, after Mr. Johnson had gone away. A—

Yes, after Mr. Johnson had gone away. A—

Yes, after Mr. Johnson had gone away. A—

Yes, after Mr. Johnson had gone away. A—

Yes, after Mr. Johnson had gone away. A—

Yes, after Mr. Johnson had gone away. A—

Yes, after Mr. Johnson had gone away. A—

Yes, after Mr. Johnson had gone away. A—

Yes, after Mr. Johnson had gone away. A—

Yes, after Mr. Johnson had gone away. A—

Yes, after Mr. Johnson had gone away. A—

Yes, after Mr. Johnson had gone away. A—

Yes, after Mr. Johnson had gone away. A—

want all you can tell him about Mr. Beecher

and your wife that Mr. Beecher had made

some proposals to her? A.—Yes, sir, that

was all I told him. A.—Yes, sir, that

was all I told him. A.—Yes, sir, that

was all I told him. A.—Yes, sir, that

was all I told him. A.—Yes, sir, that

was all I told him. A.—Yes, sir, that

was all I told him. A.—Yes, sir, that

was all I told him. A.—Yes, sir, that

was all I told him. A.—Yes, sir, that

was all I told him. A.—Yes, sir, that

was all I told him. A.—Yes, sir, that

was all I told him. A.—Yes, sir, that

was all I told him. A.—Yes, sir, that

was all I told him. A.—Yes, sir, that

was all I told him. A.—Yes, sir, that

was all I told him. A.—Yes, sir, that

was all I told him. A.—Yes, sir, that

was all I told him. A.—Yes, sir, that

was all I told him. A.—Yes, sir, that

was all I told him. A.—Yes, sir, that

was all I told him. A.—Yes, sir, that

was all I told him. A.—Yes, sir, that

was all I told him. A.—Yes, sir, that

was all I told him. A.—Yes, sir, that

was all I told him. A.—Yes, sir, that

was all I told him. A.—Yes, sir, that

was all I told him. A.—Yes, sir, that

was all I told him. A.—Yes, sir, that

was all I told him. A.—Yes, sir, that

was all I told him. A.—Yes, sir, that

was all I told him. A.—Yes, sir, that

was all I told him. A.—Yes, sir, that

was all I told him. A.—Yes, sir, that

was all I told him. A.—Yes, sir, that

was all I told him. A.—Yes, sir, that

was all I told him. A.—Yes, sir, that

was all I told him. A.—Yes, sir, that

was all I told him. A.—Yes, sir, that

was all I told him. A.—Yes, sir, that

was all I told him. A.—Yes, sir, that

was all I told him. A.—Yes, sir, that

was all I told him. A.—Yes, sir, that

was all I told him. A.—Yes, sir, that

Tilton, and Gordon I. Ford as to the

construction of the first-hand evidence

some minor errors as to the phrasing of

his story. Sherman provoked a general laugh

by saying that he was not a lawyer, and

was not a lawyer, and was not a lawyer,

and was not a lawyer, and was not a lawyer,

and was not a lawyer, and was not a lawyer,

and was not a lawyer, and was not a lawyer,

and was not a lawyer, and was not a lawyer,

and was not a lawyer, and was not a lawyer,

and was not a lawyer, and was not a lawyer,

and was not a lawyer, and was not a lawyer,

and was not a lawyer, and was not a lawyer,

and was not a lawyer, and was not a lawyer,

and was not a lawyer, and was not a lawyer,

and was not a lawyer, and was not a lawyer,

and was not a lawyer, and was not a lawyer,

and was not a lawyer, and was not a lawyer,

and was not a lawyer, and was not a lawyer,

and was not a lawyer, and was not a lawyer,

and was not a lawyer, and was not a lawyer,

and was not a lawyer, and was not a lawyer,

and was not a lawyer, and was not a lawyer,

and was not a lawyer, and was not a lawyer,

and was not a lawyer, and was not a lawyer,

and was not a lawyer, and was not a lawyer,

and was not a lawyer, and was not a lawyer,

and was not a lawyer, and was not a lawyer,

and was not a lawyer, and was not a lawyer,

and was not a lawyer, and was not a lawyer,

and was not a lawyer, and was not a lawyer,

and was not a lawyer, and was not a lawyer,

and was not a lawyer, and was not a lawyer,

and was not a lawyer, and was not a lawyer,

and was not a lawyer, and was not a lawyer,

and was not a lawyer, and was not a lawyer,

and was not a lawyer, and was not a lawyer,

and was not a lawyer, and was not a lawyer,

and was not a lawyer, and was not a lawyer,

and was not a lawyer, and was not a lawyer,

and was not a lawyer, and was not a lawyer,

and was not a lawyer, and was not a lawyer,

and was not a lawyer, and was not a lawyer,

and was not a lawyer, and was not a lawyer,

SOUTHERN AFFAIRS.

LOUISIANA.

THE TREATY.

Special Dispatch to The Chicago Tribune.

New Orleans, Feb. 8.—There has been

considerable excitement to-day, consequent upon

the action of the Legislature of Louisiana in

passing a resolution regarding the legality

of the Kellogg Government. The article of

agreement is as follows:

WHEREAS, It is desirable to adjust the

difficulties growing out of the general election in

the month of November last, in the State of

Louisiana, and to settle the organization of

the House of Representatives on the 4th

day of January next, and to settle the

organization of the Senate on the 4th day

of January next, and to settle the

organization of the Executive on the 4th

day of January next, and to settle the

organization of the Judiciary on the 4th

day of January next, and to settle the

organization of the Executive on the 4th

day of January next, and to settle the

organization of the Judiciary on the 4th

day of January next, and to settle the

organization of the Executive on the 4th

day of January next, and to settle the

organization of the Judiciary on the 4th

day of January next, and to settle the

organization of the Executive on the 4th

day of January next, and to settle the

organization of the Judiciary on the 4th

day of January next, and to settle the

